

Sage-Grouse Executive Order 2011-5 DDCT Worksheet

This worksheet is a tool for reviewers and preparers of the Greater Sage-Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) Core Area Protection Executive Order 2011-5 (SGEO) Density/Disturbance Calculation Tool (DDCT) (Attachment B-Permitting Process & Stipulations for Development) to help determine project compliance with the SGEO based on DDCT inputs and outputs, and other pertinent project information.

Please describe the following aspects of the proposed project (or provide a project narrative with this worksheet):

1. Who is the project proponent?
2. What is the proposed project? Please describe all aspects of the project, including proposed surface disturbance acreage, and actions related to the implementation of the project that may result in disturbance or disruption within sage-grouse core area.
3. Where will the proposed project occur? Please provide information such as county or locality, township/range/section(s), surface and/or mineral ownership, etc.
4. When will the development of the proposed project begin and end, and what is the expected life of the project?

Please provide answers to the following questions pertaining to Executive Order 2011-5 with appropriate detail:

Part I	Item	Reference	Answer	Comments
1.	Is the DDCT boundary correctly delineated using a 4mi buffer around the proposed disturbance (i.e., project) and 4mi buffers around the perimeter of occupied core area leks?	SGEO pg. 7	Yes – No	
2.	Is the disturbance in the DDCT area accurately accounted for?	SGEO pg. 7-8		
	a. Are all existing surface disturbances within the DDCT area accounted for?		Yes – No	*including disturbances that may be difficult to see on the imagery such as utility corridors

Sage-Grouse Executive Order 2011-5 DDCT Worksheet

	b. Have permitted but not yet implemented activities been digitized and counted as disturbance and/or as disruptions?		Yes – No	*proponent may check with permitting agencies to determine whether or not these types of activities exist in the DDCT area (i.e., BLM, DEQ, WOGCC)
	c. Is the proposed disturbance associated with the project accurately accounted for?		Yes – No	
3.	Is the project located in a northeast WY core area? (i.e., Buffalo, North Gillette, Thunder Basin, Newcastle, Douglas, North Glenrock, or Natrona north of Hwy 20/26 and north of Casper Mtn.)	SGEO pg. 11, 14-15	Yes – No	
	a. If yes , has the pre-1994 habitat conversion/treatment disturbance been accurately accounted for and removed from the disturbance (i.e., counted as 0)?		Yes – No	
4.	Were there any large sagebrush disturbing wildfires or treatments within the DDCT area?	SGEO pg. 14	Yes – No	
	a. If yes and included as disturbance, has a management plan been implemented to restore the area to functional sage-grouse habitat?		Yes – No	*must provide documentation and/or land management agency contact
	b. Is the wildfire/treatment area (pre-2011) being considered transitional sage-grouse habitat?		Yes – No	
5.	Was the entire DDCT area considered suitable habitat by the proponent for the purpose of the DDCT?	SGEO pg. 8	Yes – No	
	a. If no , was a habitat assessment completed?		Yes – No	
6.	Is the project (proposed disturbance and the permit area) within a Wyoming Oil &	SGEO pg. 2, 12	Yes – No	

Sage-Grouse Executive Order 2011-5 DDCT Worksheet

	Gas Conservation Commission drilling/spacing unit or within a Federal oil and gas unit established prior to August 1, 2008?			
	a. If yes , was the unit plan of development considered in the density/ disturbance calculations and how was it counted?		Yes – No	
7.	Is the DDCT area overlapped by a pre-August 1, 2008 unit, but the project lies outside the unit?		Yes – No	
	a. If yes , was the unit plan of development considered in the density/disturbance calculations and how was it counted?		Yes – No	
8.	Did the proponent use the correct lek perimeter file (updated annually by WGFD)?		Yes – No	
9.	Was an individual lek analysis completed/provided?	SGEO pg. 7	Yes – No	

Part II	Item	Reference	Answer	Comments
1.	Is the DDCT disturbance calculation output within the 5% surface disturbance threshold?	SGEO pg. 8-9	Yes – No	
2.	Is all surface occupancy >0.6mi from the perimeter of occupied leks?	SGEO pg. 9	Yes – No	
3.	Are seasonal stipulations for development activities (March 15 – June 30) being applied to the project?	SGEO pg. 9	Yes – No	
	a. Have sage-grouse winter concentration areas been identified in the project area and are seasonal stipulations (Dec. 1 – March 14)		Yes – No	*proponent may check with BLM or WGFD

Sage-Grouse Executive Order 2011-5 DDCT Worksheet

	being applied to the project?			
4.	Are main roads associated with the project located >1.9 miles and access/maintenance roads located >0.6mi from the perimeter of occupied leks?	SGEO pg. 9	Yes – No	
5.	Will there be new transmission or distribution lines constructed as a result of the project?	SGEO pg. 4, 9	Yes – No	
	a. If yes , have the right-of-way and all disturbance associated with construction been accurately counted in the disturbance calculation?		Yes – No	
	b. Will new lines be co-located in existing corridors?		Yes – No	
	c. Will new lines be buried?		Yes – No	
	d. If no , will they be >0.6mi from perimeter of any occupied leks and raptor-proofed?		Yes – No	
6.	March 1 – May 15: Will noise (activity) associated with the project occur between 6PM and 8AM?	SGEO pg. 9	Yes – No	
	a. If yes , were ambient noise level measurements taken at sunrise at lek perimeters to ensure that new noise is limited to 10 dBA above baseline?		Yes – No	
7.	Is vegetation removal associated with the project planned between March 15 and June 30 within 4mi of an occupied lek?	SGEO pg. 9-10	Yes – No	
	a. If yes , what are the potential impacts if any?			
8.	Does the project include vegetation treatment?	SGEO pg. 10, 14	Yes – No	

Sage-Grouse Executive Order 2011-5 DDCT Worksheet

	a. If yes , does the treatment comply with Executive Order 2011-5 and WGFD sagebrush treatment protocols?	WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush	Yes – No	
	b. What measuring protocols were used to assess the total sagebrush cover prior to treatment?			
	c. If the treatment will not be counted as disturbance (i.e., treatment area will remain suitable habitat), what controls will be used to ensure that cover does not fall below protocol thresholds?			
9.	Has the proponent agreed to monitor affected and surrounding (control) leks?	SGEO pg. 10	Yes – No	
	a. If yes , will they coordinate with the permitting agency and local WGFD biologist to determine monitoring/data needs?		Yes – No	
	b. Does the proponent indicate a willingness to use adaptive management if there are declines on monitored leks determined to be caused by the project?		Yes – No	
	c. If yes , what actions could be taken?			
10.	Does the reclamation plan comply with Executive Order 2011-5?	SGEO pg. 10	Yes – No	

Part III	Item	Reference	Answer	Comments
1.	If the project includes oil and gas development and/or mining activity, is the 1 /640 density calculation accurate and within Executive Order 2011-5 guidelines?	SGEO pg. 12	Yes – No	

Sage-Grouse Executive Order 2011-5 DDCT Worksheet

2.	Is the project located in a sage-grouse connectivity corridor?	SGEO pg. 12-13	Yes – No	
	a. If yes , is a 0.6mi Controlled Surface Use (CSU) buffer being applied around occupied lek perimeters?		Yes – No	
	b. Are timing stipulations (March 15 – June 30) being applied to the project within nesting habitat within 4mi of leks?		Yes – No	

Part IV	Item	Reference	Answer	Comments
1.	Are there any deviations from Executive Order 2011-5 process or stipulations?	SGEO pg. 4, 12-13	Yes – No	
	a. If yes , is there a likelihood that local sage-grouse populations will decline?		Yes – No	
2.	Are there additional mitigation efforts being proposed by the proponent or recommended by the biologist that could be implemented to offset anticipated impacts to sage-grouse?		Yes – No	